DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 824 IR 051 485

AUTHOR Mech, Terrence
TITLE Staffing Patterns in Pennsylvania's Private College Libraries: Survey Results.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Higher Education; Library Administration; Library Automation; *Library Personnel; Library Research; *Library Services; Library Statistics; Library Surveys; Library Technical Processes; *Private Colleges; Questionnaires; Staff Utilization
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this brief descriptive study was to determine the levels of professional and support staffing within the administrative, technical, public, and media services areas of Pennsylvania's private college libraries. The study also includes comparative data on student assistant staffing. Questionnaires were mailed to library directors of 60 private colleges in Pennsylvania. Colleges surveyed were private, Middle States accredited institutions designated as II A (diverse post-baccalaureate programs, but no significant doctorate level programs) and II B (baccalaureate institutions) according to the American Association of University Professors' rating scale. The questionnaire was a modified version of the Council of Independent Colleges' Library Cost and Services Module, Data Collection Instrument. Usable responses were received from 35 colleges (58%), including both colleges with national reputations and less prestigious colleges with limited resources. Findings are reported in the areas of staff composition and distribution, student assistants, automation, and other factors. Comparisons are also made with "The Standards for College Libraries" and the results of a survey of Pennsylvania's state college libraries. A copy of the questionnaire is included. (Author/THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OERI
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official position or policy.

ED267824

STAFFING PATTERNS IN PENNSYLVANIA'S PRIVATE COLLEGE LIBRARIES: SURVEY RESULTS

Terrence Mech
Library Director
King's College
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18711
November 1985

IR051485

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Terrence Mech
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

Despite the growing use of comparative data by libraries there is a lack of normative data on staffing within the different library service areas. The major purpose of this brief descriptive study was to determine the levels of professional and support staffing within the administrative, technical, public and media services areas of Pennsylvania's Private College Libraries. The study also includes comparative data on student assistant staffing.

STAFFING PATTERNS IN PENNSYLVANIA'S PRIVATE COLLEGE LIBRARIES: SURVEY RESULTS

One of a library's great resources is its staff. Yet, effectively allocating library personnel across a library's service areas is no simple task. The task does not lend itself to rigid formulas. Knowledge of how library staffs are allocated will foster more efficient utilization of a library's limited staff resources. A literature review indicates numerous articles on standards or proposed staffing formulas, but less than a handful of articles on staffing patterns within various library departments. Those few departmental staffing studies were limited to single departments within large universities. This study is a descriptive examination of professional and support staffing patterns within the administrative, technical, public and media service areas of 35 of Pennsylvania's private college libraries. Comparisons are also made with "The Standards for College Libraries"[1] and Pennsylvania's state college libraries.

Pennsylvania contains over 60 private colleges. Colleges surveyed were private, Middle States accredited institutions designated as II A (diverse post-baccalaureate programs, but no significant doctorate level programs) and II B (baccalaureate institutions) according to the American Association of University Professors rating scale. In February 1985, questionnaires were sent to library directors of 60 private colleges in Pennsylvania. The questionnaire was a modified version of the Council of Independent Colleges' Library Cost and Services Module, Data Collection Instrument. Over a 2 month period 35 usable questionnaires were returned, a 58 percent return rate.

Responses came from colleges with national reputations and less prestigious colleges with limited resources. Undergraduate enrollment at the colleges averaged 1,517 students, with enrollments ranging from 250 to 3,964. Half of the colleges reported graduate enrollments ranging from 7 to 500 students. Total student enrollment averaged 1,606 with a range of 250 to 4,254 students. Libraries in this study were not large. Total volume count ranged from 54,000 to 490,562 volumes with a median of 143,614. Volumes added ranged from 544 to 16,927 with a median of 3,683.

"Standards for College Libraries" was intended to "describe a realistic set of conditions which if fulfilled, will provide an adequate library program in a college."[2] Formula B of "Standards for College Libraries" determines the adequate number of professional librarians needed in a library as follows:

One librarian: For each 500 (or fraction) FTE students up to 10,000
One librarian: For each 1,000 (or fraction) FTE students over 10,000
One librarian: For each 100,000 volumes (or fraction) in the collection
One librarian: For each 5,000 volumes (or fraction) added per year

Formula B has a grading system for professional staffing as follows: when supported by sufficient other staff members libraries that provide 100 percent of the requirements are at level A; libraries that provide 75-99 percent of the requirements are at level B; libraries that provide 55-74 percent of the requirements are at level C; libraries that provide 40-54 percent of the requirements are at level D.[3] Of the private college libraries surveyed, 43 percent met Formula B at the A level or better; 34 percent met the formula at the B level; 20 percent met the formula at the C level; and 3 percent were at the D level. Fifty-seven percent of the libraries surveyed

were professionally understaffed according to Formula B. The severity of the professional shortages ranged from 4 to 52 percent, with over half needing an additional 20 percent or more professionals to meet Formula B at the A level. In terms of full-time equivalent professionals, these libraries required from .3 to 3 additional professionals with an average of 1.3 to operate at the A level of Formula B. Those libraries that met Formula B at the A level were found mainly at wealthy colleges, or colleges that were operated by religious orders of women.

The Standards, regardless of how well intentioned, are still regarded by many as ideal. In order to deal with reality many libraries are using comparative data, measuring themselves against actual measures of library support and staffing. Comparative staff data is frequently stated as a ratio to make comparison easier. Staffing ratios are frequently expressed in terms of students per librarian. In this study the median FTE students per professional ratio was 277 students per professional, with an average ratio of 287.87 FTE students per professional. The range was from 46.27 to 622.81 FTE students per professional.

Comparative data allows libraries to compare staff size against some type of norm. But the Standards and comparative data do not tell us how staff are allocated across library service areas. Making the best use of existing staff is extremely important. Technology provides for increased efficiencies in technical services. At the same time database services create additional demands in public services. In many libraries technical service staff are working part-time in public service areas. Libraries traditionally have been understaffed. However, by examining staff distribution within college libraries, individual libraries may be able to compare and examine how they utilize their staff.

STAFF COMPOSITION AND DISTRIBUTION

This study examines the distribution of professional and support staff within the administrative, technical, public and media service areas of 35 private college libraries in Pennsylvania. Administrative services includes such functions as budgeting and reporting, public relations, personnel administration, building supervision and policy development. Technical services includes such functions as book selection, acquisitions, periodicals, cataloging, processing, billing, shipping, receiving, and government documents. Public services includes such functions as circulation, reference, library instruction, interlibrary loan and reserves. Media services includes such functions as operation and maintenance of audio-visual/television equipment, graphic and photographic production.

The median library staff in this study is composed of 5 FTE professionals, 5.75 FTE support and 4.71 FTE student assistants (see TABLE 1). The number of hours in the work week was about equal for both professional and support staff. The professional staff work week averaged 36.5 hours, with a median of 35 hours per week. Support staff worked an average of 36.33 hours per week with a median of 35 hours. The median library staff was 30 percent professional, 40 percent support personnel, and 30 percent student assistants (see TABLE 2). When student assistants are not figured in, the median library staff was composed of 43.17 percent professional and 56.41 percent support personnel.

TABLE 1
FTE Staffing Levels

	PROFESSIONAL n= 35	SUPPORT n=35	STUDENT n=31	TOTAL
Average	6.17	7.18	5.73	19.84
Median	5	5.75	4.71	15.30
Range	1.83 - 13	1.5 - 19.14	.64 - 18.95	5.47 - 49.6

TABLE 2
Staff Type as Percent of Total Staff

	PROFESSIONAL n=35	SUPPORT n=35	STUDENT n=31
Average	33.52	37.29	28.99
Median	30.09	40.39	30.01
Range	22.11 - 55	15.29 - 64.48	4.34 - 60.78
EXCLUDES STUDENT ASSISTANTS			
Average	48.54	51.45	
Median	43.17	56.41	
Range	31.81 - 71.28	28.72 - 68.19	

"Standards for College Libraries" call for a library staff to consist of 25-35 percent professionals.[4] This equals a professional to support staff ratio ranging from 1:3 (25 percent professionals) to 1:1.9 (35 percent professionals). In this study the median professional to support staff ratio was 1:1.32 (43 percent professionals). For every one FTE professional, the library employed one and one-third FTE support staff (see TABLE 3). The average library staff had a professional to support staff ratio of a little more than one to one, 1:1.17 (46 percent professionals). An overall professional to support staff ratio anywhere near one to one (50 percent professionals) may not be the most efficent utilization of professional or support staff for most libraries.

It is not uncommon in some college libraries for professional and support staff members to do a little of everything, or to be split between cataloging and reference. For this study directors were asked to prorate the functions of their personnel across service areas without regard to the job titles of personnel. This information was converted into full-time equivalents.

The median library staff in this study contained 1 administrator, 1.92 technical service professionals, 2 public service professionals and 1 media service professional (see TABLE 3). Support for these professionals consisted of 1 administrative support, 3 technical services support, 2.5 public services support and 1 media services support.

Within administrative services it was typically one director and one secretary. The median professional to support staff ratio within administrative services is 1:.96 (see TABLE 3). But this was not true everywhere. Almost one-third of the directors reported no support staff for adminstrative services. The median administrative services staff constituted 12.44 percent of total staff (see TABLE 4).

Technical services tended to have the largest staff, usually comprising 40 percent of total library staff (see TABLE 4). Technical services typically consisted of about one-third of the total professional staff and 50 percent of the total support staff. The professional to support staff ratio in technical services was one professional to 2 support staff (see TABLE 3). In a few cases student assistants exclusively supported professionals in technical services.

The median public services staff constituted 38 percent of the total library staff. Public services used 40 percent of the total professional staff and 37.68 percent of total support staff (see TABLE 4). The professional to support ratio within public services was one to one (see TABLE 3). Although public services uses slightly more professionals than technical services, it receives half as much support staff. A look at student assistant staffing indicates that public services, particularly circulation, tends to employ the largest portion of a library's student assistants.

Media services were provided by only 19 of 35 libraries. Several of the libraries indicated that media services were offered through other offices

or departments on their campuses. Even where offered, media service constituted only a small part of the total library staff, 10 percent. The median media services staff consisted of 18 percent of a library's professional and 11 percent of the library's support staff (see TABLE 4). The median professional to support staff ratio is one professional to not quite one support staff, 1:.88 (see TABLE 3).

TABLE 3
Library Staff
Private College Libraries

	PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT	TOTAL	SUPPORT STAFF PER PROFESSIONAL
Administration n=35				
Average	1.05	.65	1.70	.84
Median	1	1	1.75	.96
Range	.3 - 3	0 - 2.25	.5 - 4.33	.07 - 2.19
Technical Services n=35				
Average	2.22	3.58	5.67	2.09
Median	1.92	3	4.3	1.92
Range	.33 - 6	0 - 10.14	1.1 - 14.5	.49 - 6
Public Services n=35				
Average	2.5	2.68	5.26	1.22
Median	2	2.5	4.08	1
Range	.66 - 6.5	0 - 8	.66 - 14.5	.05 - 4
Media Services n=19				
Average	.70	.60	1.30	.76
Median	1	1	1	.88
Range	0 - 2	0 - 2	0 - 4	.05 - 1.38
Total n=35				
Average	6.17	7.18	13.35	1.17
Median	5	5.75	10	1.32
Range	1.83 - 13	1.5 - 19.14	3.9 - 32.14	.4 - 2.14

TABLE 4
Percent of Staff in Service Areas
Private College Libraries

	PERCENT OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT OF SUPPORT STAFF IN SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT OF TOTAL STAFF IN SERVICE AREAS
Administration			
n=35			
Average	19.19	15.87	18.84
Median	18.75	9.52	12.44
Range	6.53 - 34.58	0 - 63.63	4.51 - 36.69
Technical Services			
n=35			
Average	33.61	50.72	41.12
Median	32.08	50	40.25
Range	17.64 - 66.66	0 - 100	15.82 - 65.63
Public Services			
n=35			
Average	39.79	39.76	38.27
Median	40	37.68	38.09
Range	14.54 - 62.1	0 - 100	9.4 - 58.86
Media Services			
n=35			
Average	15.23	12.70	10.62
Median	18.18	11.73	10
Range	0 - 25	0 - 40	0 - 27.06

STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Student assistants are an important staffing component not only in the portion of the staff they constitute but in the amount of time they require for hiring, training, and supervision. Student assistants tended to make up 30 percent of the entire staff (see TABLE 2). Student assistants worked a median of 8,775 hours the equivalent of 4.71 full-time support staff (see TABLE 5). For every full-time support staff member employed, libraries

employed almost three-fourths of an equivalent support staff member in student assistants.

TABLE 5
Student Assistants
n=31

	HOURS OF STUDENT ASSISTANCE	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS	STUDENT ASSISTANTS PER SUPPORT STAFF
Average	10,002	5.73	1.01
Median	8,775	4.71	.72
Range	787 - 33,165	.64 - 18.95	.09 - 3.97

Most student assistants are paid by federal work study funds. Because of local considerations and idiosyncrasies in the distribution of financial aid to students, libraries are often caught in the middle. Ideally a library will hire an eligible freshman or even a sophomore who can work a minimum of ten hours or more a week. This student, if satisfactory, would then continue to work in the library until graduation. In some cases libraries have no say in the students they can hire, much less dismiss. In one case, someone's idea of financial aid distribution is to give the library many student aides but only for a few hours a week. One respondent's situation was described as follows: "The average student assistant works 5 hours a week. Utilization is not cost effective. They are useful because we need bodies. Only 3 students, each alloted 12 hours weekly and paid from library budget, are worth training."

AUTOMATION

Automation at one time was heralded as a means of reducing library staff. In reality it never happened because automation does not really eliminate staff. Automation merely permits current staff to work more efficiently

and provide better service. OCLC was the most frequent form of automation used by 31 of the 35 libraries surveyed. Libraries used OCLC for cataloging (31), interlibrary loan (29), acquisitions (8) and serials (1). The number of OCLC terminals per library ranged from one to four, with a median of one.

Other automation efforts ranged from in house developments to major vendor systems. Three libraries reported using circulation systems developed in house. Serials were popular targets for automation. Three libraries reported some type of serials automation, from batch serials listing to automated check-in on the college mainframe. Acquisitions is probably the easiest and most popular function to automate. One library reported an in-house acquisitions system run on the college mainframe computer. Three libraries reported acquiring Bib-Base/Acq, a microcomputer based acquisition system designed, developed and supported by Robert J. Kepple of Small Library Computing. Since this study was conducted, other libraries in the survey also acquired this microcomputer based system. One library is part of the Western Pennsylvania Buhl Network (WEBNET), a research and development project of the School of Library and Information Science, University of Pittsburgh. WEBNET provides automated acquisitions, catalog and circulation systems. Another library is in the process of implementing the Virginia Tech Library System (VTLS). Other libraries in the study are converting records and investigating various automated systems. Automation is just now beginning to become a reality for some college libraries. As costs drop and technology improves, automation will increasingly be found in college libraries because of the relatively small investment required to automate a college library.

OTHER FACTORS

Other factors that influenced the size or composition of library staffs were the library building itself, special collections, and Government Document

Depositories. A number of libraries indicated that the design of their library building influenced the size and utilization of their library staff. One library reported that because of poor library design it was necessary to staff extra service points. The existence of departmental libraries or the location of media services in a separate building resulted in the need for additional staff for some libraries. A few of the departmental libraries were reportedly staffed mainly with student assistants. Then again other libraries reported that the design of their buildings contributed to efficiency, because centralized service points and an "excellent library design permit good work flow."

The existence of special collections, archives and document depositories were other frequently reported influences on library staff size and utilization. Six libraries reported that their special collections or archives affected the size of their staff. Four libraries indicated that their Government Documents Depositories or collections were a factor in their staff's size and composition. As a result of having government documents or other special collections, libraries reported that staff were assigned part-time or full-time responsibilities in these areas. These are staff assignments that other libraries do not have to make. Unions were not mentioned as being a factor in the staffing of these Pennsylvania private college libraries.

COMPARISON WITH STATE COLLEGES

Pennsylvania's II A and II B state related college libraries were also surveyed at the same time as the private college libraries. Ten out of 17 of the state-related college libraries responded (55 percent). Responses from the ten state-related college libraries may be of value in examining staff distribution in Pennsylvania's private college libraries.

The state colleges and their libraries over all are bigger than their private counter parts. Student enrollments at state related colleges are

on the average three to four times as big as the private colleges. State college libraries' collections and annual volumes added are generally twice as large as the private college libraries. Circulation and interlibrary loan are three times as active as private college libraries. Yet the median state college library staff is only twice as big as the median private college library (see TABLE 6). Librarians at state colleges serve a median of 436 students each, compared to private college librarians who each serve a median of 277 students. According to Formula B of "Standards for College Libraries" only 11 percent of the state related college libraries met the formula at the A level; 22 percent at the B level; 56 percent at the C level; and 11 percent at the D level. According to this, the private college libraries are generally better staffed than the state college libraries.

Although state college library staffs are twice as large as private college library staffs, the distribution of those staffs, with few exceptions, was not noticeably different. The median state college library staff was composed of 28 percent professionals, 37 percent support and almost 36 percent student assistants. The median private college library staff was composed of 30 percent professionals, 40 percent support and 30 percent students assistants. The biggest difference between the state and private colleges is their use of student assistants. State college libraries use more student assistants per support staff than the private colleges. As a result, the total staff in state college libraries is comprised of almost 36 percent student assistants, compared to only 30 percent for the private college libraries. When student assistants are removed from the analysis, state and private college libraries are made up of almost equal percentages of professional and support staff. State college library staffs are 44 percent professional and 55 percent support, compared to private college library staffs which were 43 percent professional and 56 percent support.

TABLE 6
Library Staff
State College Libraries

	PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT	TOTAL	SUPPORT STAFF PER PROFESSIONAL
Administration n=10				
Average	1.12	1.13	2.16	1.02
Median	1	1	2	1
Range	.91 - 1.83	.16 - 3	1 - 4.66	.09 - 2.11
Technical Services n=10				
Average	3.32	4.93	8.44	1.65
Median	3	4.5	8.13	1.68
Range	.08 - 9.9	2 - 10	3 - 16.4	.66 - 2.86
Public Services n=10				
Average	5.59	4.66	10.43	.89
Median	5.25	4.75	9.5	.81
Range	3 - 9.5	3 - 6	7 - 15.5	.5 - 1.67
Media Services n=9				
Average	1.38	1.91	2.90	1.72
Median	1	2	2.5	1
Range	0 - 3.85	0 - 4	.91 - 6.25	.62 - 4
Total n=10				
Average	11.1	12.25	23.35	1.16
Median	10.25	12	22.17	1.24
Range	7 - 24.16	6 - 18	13 - 41.82	.73 - 1.43

TABLE 7
Percent of Staff in Service Areas
State College Libraries

	PERCENT OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT OF SUPPORT STAFF IN SERVICE AREAS	PERCENT OF TOTAL STAFF IN SERVICE AREAS
Administration n=10			
Average	11.23	8.65	9.43
Median	11.51	7.69	9.02
Range	6.2 - 15.02	1.74 - 17.89	6.25 - 13.19
Technical Services n=10			
Average	30.63	40.97	34.71
Median	31.57	40.28	36.93
Range	14.29 - 40.97	20 - 55.55	17.64 - 48.68
Public Services n=10			
Average	54.24	40.34	46.69
Median	51.68	39.63	46.61
Range	38.58 - 87.71	25 - 54.58	33.13 - 69.23
Media Services n=9			
Average	14.15	13.63	11.53
Median	9.09	12.37	10.94
Range	0 - 28.57	0 - 25	3.12 - 23.52

Regardless of size, it takes about the same number of staff to administer a state college library as it does a private college library. But because state college library staffs are larger their administrative staff comprises a smaller percentage of their total staff (see TABLE 7). It is worth noting that public service in state college libraries accounts for the largest percentage of the professional and total staff, ten percent more than in

private college libraries. Yet the percentage of support staff in both state (39.63) and private (37.68) college libraries is about the same. Technical services on the other hand contains the largest percentage of support and total staff in private college libraries. The median percentage of professional staff devoted to technical service in state (31.57) and private (32.08) college libraries is about the same.

CONCLUSION

Private college libraries have traditionally faced the challenge of having to do more with less. That challenge continues to increase. The extent to which private college libraries can effectively allocate and utilize their existing staff means the difference between getting by and operating efficiently while providing improved services.

Pennsylvania's private college libraries are largely understaffed according to the "Standards for College Libraries". The median library staff is composed of 30 percent professionals, 40 percent support and 30 percent student assistants. The percentage of professional and support staff in Pennsylvania's private college libraries is about the same percentage as those found in Pennsylvania's larger state-related college libraries. The average private college library had a professional to support staff ratio of little more than one to one. Technical services tends to have the largest share of the typical private college library staff. In state-related college libraries, public services tends to have the largest portion of the total staff. Private college libraries, particularly the smaller ones are very dependent on student assistants.

Automation exclusive of OCLC has not really made inroads in private college libraries, although there are signs that automation efforts are increasing and technical services will be the first to benefit. The question

remains, to what extent will automation free staff for public services? Or, will automation be imposed on traditional staffing patterns?

College libraries will have to continue to do more with limited staffing. Every opportunity to evaluate and compare how efficiently they distribute and utilize their staffs should be taken. College libraries must learn to work smarter, not harder. A library's staff is its single greatest resource. The efficient allocation and utilization of that resource are not simple tasks. While this study describes staff allocation in Pennsylvania's private college libraries, additional research is needed to provide more and finer detail on staff allocation in the nation's college libraries.

REFERENCES

1. "Standards for College Libraries." **College & Research Libraries** 36:277-79, 290-301 (Oct. 1975).
2. Ibid., p. 277.
3. Ibid., p. 291.
4. Ibid., p. 292.

STAFFING QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

A. **Use "NA" (NOT AVAILABLE) for items you are unable to calculate.**

B. **Use "EST" for items not available but you feel comfortable with an ESTIMATE, include the response and indicate "EST".**

C. **Data requested are for the 1983-84 year unless otherwise indicated.**

1. Full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment, Fall 1984. _____

2. Full-time equivalent graduate enrollment, Fall 1984. _____

3. Total full-time equivalent enrollment, Fall 1984. _____

BOOKSTOCK, NUMBER OF VOLUMES (INCLUDE GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS NOT IN SEPARATE COLLECTION; INCLUDE BOUND PERIODICALS; EXCLUDE MICROFORMS).

4. Gross number of volumes added, 1983-84 year. _____

5. Total number of volumes held end of 1983-84 year. _____

6. Gross number of Government Documents (in separate collection) added, 1983-84 year. _____

7. Total number of Government Documents (in separate collection) held end of 1983-84 year. _____

8. Current periodical subscriptions, Fall 1984. _____

9. Number of hours of student assistance, 1983-84 year. _____

CIRCULATION OF MATERIALS TO LIBRARY USERS (TOTAL LENDING, INCLUDING RENEWALS OF ANY MATERIALS DIRECTLY TO USERS) 1983-84.

10. General circulation (exclude reserves). _____

11. Reserves _____

INTERLIBRARY LOANS - NUMBER OF ITEMS IN ORIGINAL AND REPRODUCED FORMAT 1983-84.

12. Provided to other libraries. _____

13. Received from other libraries. _____

14. Reference Transactions - Any requests which required use of library materials or a librarian's professional judgement to answer the question (exclude directional transactions), 1983-84. _____

15. Group Transactions - Contact in which staff provided information services intended for a number of persons, e.g. tours, lectures, bibliographic instruction, 1983-84. _____

16. Turnstile count (library visits) - number of people who entered the library facility for any purpose, 1983-84. _____

17. Total hours open per typical week, Fall 1984. _____

18. Number of hours in a typical support staff work week (e.g. 35, 37, 40), Fall 1984. _____

19. Number of hours in a typical professional staff work week, Fall 1984. _____

20. Number of hours of professional reference staffing in a typical week, Fall 1984. _____

21. Number of database searches conducted, 1983-84 year. _____

22. Number of OCLC terminals in operation. _____

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING OCLC SYSTEMS DO YOU USE?

23. Cataloging _____ 24. Interlibrary loan _____ 25. Acquisitions _____ 26. Serials _____

27. In addition to your use of OCLC, are other operations automated? Please describe, e.g. Circulation - Dataphase, Acquisitions - Bib-Base/Acq.

LIBRARY PERSONNEL

NOTE: Since most college library personnel serve in more than one functional capacity, it may be necessary to prorate some of your personnel across more than one function. Your response should reflect a person's functions, not job titles! If a person's time is committed in part to a non-library function, **exclude** this portion of time.

Service Months* of Librarians and other Professional Staff*** by function.** **FALL 1984**

28. Administrative Services (includes such functions as budgeting and reporting, public relations, personnel administration, building supervision, policy development). _____

29. Technical Services (includes such functions as book selection, acquisitions, periodicals, cataloging, processing, billing, shipping, receiving, government documents). _____

30. Public Services (includes such functions as circulation, reference, interlibrary loan, teaching, reserves). _____

31. Media Services (includes such functions as operation and maintenance of audio-visual/ television equipment, graphic and photographic production). _____

*A service month is equivalent to one individual working full-time for one month. A person who works half-time for 9 months of the year would be computed as 4.5 (0.5 x 9) service months per year. For persons on 12-month contracts, prorate all 12 months, even though one month is assumed to be a vacation period.

**HEGIS/LIBGIS defines librarians as "staff members doing work that requires professional training and skills in the theoretical or scientific aspect of library work, as distinct from its mechanical or clerical aspect."

***HEGIS/LIBGIS defines other professional staff as "persons who though not librarians are in positions normally requiring at least a bachelor's degree (e.g., curators, archivists, computer specialists, information and system specialists, subject bibliographers, media specialists, etc.)."

Service Months of Technicians, Clerical Staff, and other Supporting Staff* by function **FALL 1984**

32. Administrative Services (see explanation in Item 28). _____

33. Technical Services (see exlanation in Item 29). _____

34. Public Services (see explanation in Item 30). _____

35. Media Services (see explanation in Item 31). _____

*HEGIS/LIBGIS defines these employees as "persons in technical assistance, receiving, shipping, storing, secretarial duties, etc., (exclusive of custodial services and students serving on an hourly basis) who are specifically assigned to the library and are covered in the library budget."

36. Are there any unusual circumstances that affect the size or arrangement of your staff, such as building design, special collections, archives, government depository, unions, etc.?

37. Additional comments and suggestions.

This instrument is a modified version of the Council of Independent Colleges' Library Cost & Services Module data collection instrument. Permission to adopt the copyrighted instrument was given.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION